

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action dated January 24, 2008 (“the Office Action”). Claims 26-65 are currently pending. Claims 26, 31, and 42 have been amended. No new matter has been added with the amendments to the claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in accordance with the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 42-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,781,909 to Logan et al. (“*Logan*”). To the extent the rejections remain applicable to the claims, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 42 recites, in part, “displaying the pages in the list in a substantially continuous loop, using the pages stored in the local cache, until a new list of pages is received.” As noted in the Office Action, *Logan* teaches that when a requested URL or “target page” does not specify a “transition” display page “the routine selects a display page from a collection of available pages.” (*Logan*, col. 9, ll. 48-49). Discussing this routine for selecting “a page,” *Logan* teaches further that the transition page can be selected “randomly” from the collection (*id.* at col. 9, ll. 50-51) or non-randomly, for example, by selecting from a list of insertable display page URLs.

An overriding purpose of the kiosk management system of *Logan* is to “affirmatively guide the user’s attention to desired information,” while still providing the user with the ability to request certain information. (*See, e.g., id.* at col. 10, ll. 41-42; *see also* col. 14, ll. 24-33.) The transition display mechanism **113**, of which transition lists and pages are a part (*see, e.g., id.* at col. 9, ll. 34-47), also serves this general purpose. “[The] transition display mechanism **113**...provides a mechanism for displaying one or more display pages to the user before the information identified by the requested URL is displayed.” (*Id.* at col. 6, ll. 15-25.) Therefore, the transition list functions to **transition** the display to a requested target page. As a result, the display of transition pages do not continuously loop, but have a predefined end point, namely the display of the target page. Accordingly, *Logan* not only fails to teach or suggest a transition list that is displayed in a substantially continuous loop, but actually teaches against looping the

transition list. For at least these reasons, *Logan* fails to recite each and every limitation of Claim 42. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 42 be withdrawn.

Claims 43-45 depend from claim 42. In light of the grounds set forth above, *Logan* similarly fails to at least teach “displaying the pages in the list in a substantially continuous loop, using the pages stored in the local cache, until a new list of pages is received.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 43-45 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 26-27, 29-30, 47-49, 51, and 58-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Logan* in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,948,066 to Whalen et al. (“*Whalen*”). To the extent the rejections remain applicable to the claims, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and all assertions therein.

Claim 26 recites limitations similar to the limitations in independent claim 42. In particular, Claim 26 recites, in part, “displaying each page of the rotation set, wherein the pages are retrieved from the cache and displayed in the predetermined sequence in a substantially continuous loop until a new rotation set is received.” Neither *Logan* nor *Whalen* teach or suggest a rotation set, wherein the pages of the rotation set are displayed in a substantially continuous loop.

For at least the reasons discussed above with regard to the rejection of Claim 42, *Logan* fails to teach or suggest this feature of the claim. Additionally, it has not been shown how *Whalen*, either by itself or in combination with *Logan*, overcomes the deficiencies of *Logan*. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claim 26 was improper and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Logan* in view of *Whalen* and further in view of U.S. Publication No. US 2002/0078134 to Stone et al. (“*Stone*”). Claim 28 depends from Claim 26. It has not been shown how *Stone* either by itself or in combination with *Logan* and/or *Whalen* overcomes the deficiencies of *Logan* and *Whalen*. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is improper for at least the same reasons articulated regarding Claim 26.

Claims 31-32 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2002/0046299 to Lefeber et al. ("*Lefeber*") in further view of *Logan* in view of *Whalen* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,311,187 to Jeyaraman et al. ("*Jeyaraman*"). Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claims are unpatentable over the cited art.

Claim 31 recites limitations similar to the limitations in independent Claims 26 and 42. In particular, Claim 31 recites, in part, at least one display device adapted to "display each page of the rotation set, wherein the pages are retrieved from the cache and displayed in the predetermined sequence in a substantially continuous loop until a new rotation set is received." As stated in the Office Action, *Lefeber* does not teach "receiving a rotation set comprising a list identifying pages to be displayed in a predetermined sequence." Additionally, *Lefeber*, also fails to teach a rotation set displayed in a substantially continuous loop (Office Action, page 13). In addition, for at least the reasons previously mentioned in connection with Claim 42, *Logan* does not teach or suggest this feature of the claim. Furthermore, it has also not been shown how *Jeyaraman*, either alone in or in combination with *Lefeber* and/or *Logan*, overcomes the deficiencies of *Lefeber* and *Logan*. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claim 31, as well as dependent Claims 32 and 39, is improper and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 33-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber*, *Logan*, *Whalen*, and *Jeyaraman* in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2003/0084124 to Su et al. ("*Su*").

Claim 37 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber*, *Logan*, *Whalen*, and *Jeyaraman* in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2003/0005129 to Scheinkman ("*Scheinkman*").

Claims 38 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber*, *Logan*, *Whalen*, and *Jeyaraman* in further view of SearchSecurity.com, pages 1-3, published Oct. 5, 2000 ("*SearchSecurity.com*").

Claim 40 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lefeber, Logan, Whalen, and Jeyaraman* in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2004/0039776 to Ballard ("*Ballard*").

Claims 33-38, 40, and 41 depend from Claim 31. It has not been shown how *Su, Scheinkman*, the SearchSecurity.com reference, and *Ballard* either by themselves or in combination with *Lefeber, Logan*, and/or *Jeyaraman* overcome the deficiencies of *Lefeber, Logan*, and *Jeyaraman*. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 33-38, 40, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is improper for at least the same reasons articulated regarding Claim 31.

Claim 46 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Logan* in further view of *Stone*. Claim 46 depends from Claim 42. As discussed above relating to the 102(b) rejection of Claim 46, *Logan* fails to teach or suggest all the features of Claim 46. It has not been shown how *Stone*, either by itself or in combination with *Logan*, overcomes the deficiencies of *Logan*. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claim 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is improper for at least the same reasons articulated regarding the rejection of Claim 42.

Claim 50 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Logan* and *Whalen* in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2002/0016839 to Smith et al. ("*Smith*").

Claims 52-53, 55, and 63-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Logan* and *Whalen* in further view of *Lefeber*.

Claim 54 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Logan, Whalen, and Lefeber* in further view of *Smith*.

Claims 56-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Logan, Whalen, and Ballard* in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,985,950 to Hanson et al. ("*Hanson*").

Claims 61-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Logan* and *Whalen* in further view of *Ballard*.

Claims 50, 52, 53, 55-57, and 61-65 depend from Claim 26. It has not been shown how *Smith, Lefeber, Ballard, or Hanson* either by themselves or in combination with *Logan* and/or

Whalen overcome the deficiencies of *Logan* and *Whalen*. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 50, 52, 53, 55-57, and 61-65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is improper for at least the same reasons articulated regarding Claim 26.

Request for Interview

If the present Application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained or made final, Applicant hereby requests a telephone conference with the Examiner before issuing any further action, and further requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule a telephone conference.

CONCLUSION

Any circumstance in which the Applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the Applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the Applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

In view of the above, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully submits that the Application is in condition for allowance, and requests such a Notice.

No additional fees are believed due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or required fees or any credits to deposit account 05-0765, referencing the attorney docket number shown above.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 24, 2008

/J. Kyle Komenda/

J. Kyle Komenda

Reg. No. 56,556

PTO Customer No. 26230

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1717 Main Street, Suite 5000
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: (214) 292-4055
Facsimile: (214) 747-2091